

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-30 and 32-39 are pending. The Examiner's allowance of claims 14-30 and 32-39, and his indication that claims 5-13 contain allowable subject matter are gratefully acknowledged.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art shown in Fig. 3 of the Applicant's specification in view of Duren (RE 35,532). According to the Examiner, "Duren teaches the use of a weighted member that contacts the seals on a similar valve passageway only between the seats." The Examiner continues by stating that "it would have been obvious to modify the admitted prior art by contacting the seal only between the seats as taught by Duren because the valve structure of Duren was nearly identical to that of the admitted prior art."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection. As discussed at col. 3, lines 32-48, Duren discloses a sealing member 1 mounted for movement within a valve chamber. The sealing member 1 is comprised of an annular valve disk 11 constructed of rigid material structurally reinforced by ribs 12 integral with substantially the full radial extent of the upper side of the valve disk 11 and extending radially inwardly from the valve disk to a central support 8, which comprises a ring having a central aperture therein. The annular disk is further structurally reinforced by a concentric rib 9 formed on the annular sealing valve disk 11. An elastomeric membrane envelope 10 is wrapped around the annular valve disk 11 intermediate the radial extent of the upper side of the valve disk to fully cover the side of the disk that faces the inner 17 and outer 16 concentric valve seats and to partially cover the other side 10A.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, a seal configured to be seated on the first and second seats to substantially seal the fuel passageway, and a weight biasing the seal toward the first and second seats by contacting the seal only at a location between the first and second seats. These claim features are not taught or suggested by the Examiner's proposed combination of Duren with the admitted prior art shown in Fig. 3. First, Duren does not teach or suggest the use of any weight biasing a seal toward first and second seats. Rather, the

sealing member 1 of Duren is one assembly that moves as a single unit as shown by the phantom line and solid line depictions in Fig. 1 of Duren. There is no weight biasing a seal, but rather there is only the seal itself. This is also the case for the embodiment shown in Fig. 4 of Duren, which does not include the elastomeric membrane envelope 10, but rather includes O-rings 13 and 14 positioned on the seats 16A and 17A. The annular disk 11 of sealing member 1A acts as the seal and there is no weight.

Second, even if it is the Examiner's position that the elastomeric membrane envelope 10 is the seal and the rigid disk 11 is the weight (which the Applicant maintains is an inappropriate interpretation), the rigid disk clearly extends up to and beyond the radially outer and inner extents of the seats 16, 17, as shown in Fig. 1. The rigid disk does not contact the elastomeric membrane envelope 10 only at a location between the seats as claimed.

Third, the portions of the ribs 12 that connect to the upper surface of the rigid disk 11 are not weights that bias the rigid disk 11 or the elastomeric membrane envelope 10. The ribs 12 are integrally formed with the rigid disk and cannot be construed as weights that bias the rigid disk 11 or the elastomeric membrane envelope 10.

For all of these reasons, the Examiner's combination of Duren and the prior art valve shown in Fig. 3 of the Applicant's specification is improper. The combination fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1.

For these reasons, entry of this Response and allowance of claims 1-13, in addition to the previous allowance of claims 14-30 and 32-39, are respectfully requested.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Richard L. Kaiser". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "R" and "K".

Richard L. Kaiser  
Reg. No. 46,158

File No. 081276-9138-00  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
(262) 956-6576

X:\clientb\081276\9138\F0188439.1